

Patterns of peasants' political philosophy in the years of the 1905-1907 Russian Revolution

Bukhovets, O.G.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Bukhovets, O. (1991). Patterns of peasants' political philosophy in the years of the 1905-1907 Russian Revolution. *Historical Social Research*, 16(2), 60-73. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.16.1991.2.60-73>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Patterns of Peasants' Political Philosophy in the Years of the 1905-07 Russian Revolution

*O. G. Bukhovets**

Abstract: An analysis of peasant political philosophy during the years of the 1905-1907 Russian revolution is presented. As a mass source for the investigation the author used requests, appeals, resolutions and telegrams related to political development and sent by peasants' meetings to the tsar and various governmental bodies. The possibility of effective use of content analysis and modelling is demonstrated. The model built shows the many tiers existing in the peasants' political philosophy, the intricate linkages between stivings for revolution and conservative attitudes, and its overall inherent syncretism.

Recently a hot debate started in the Soviet press and among researchers on alternative scenarios that Russia could have followed in the first decades of the 20th century. The debate is, of course, a welcome development. To rise above conjectures, however, it has to be based both on a set of conceptual and theoretical provisions and on specific empirical studies.

This *sine qua non* is, unfortunately, almost absent from the current controversy. While denouncing certain provisions posited by Soviet historical science, as well as its dogmas and lifeless study patterns, critics have generally confined themselves to theorizing and did not conduct specific historical research.

No other subject of the above debate has generated so much tension and political bias as the role of the masses, especially peasants (the greater part of Russia's population at that time) in consolidating Russian totalitarianism (1). Adequate understanding of that role is, of course, impossible without a clear idea of changes that occurred in the peasants' political outlook.

Depriving peasants of a major portion of land they had worked, the 1860s' reform brought to them a very limited measure of personal freedom. In the years up to the 1905-07 revolution, autocracy aimed to per-

* Address all communications to O. G. Bukhovets, Institute of History, Minsk, Belorussia.

petuate the age-old patriarchal ways of rural residents. The peasantry that constituted 77 per cent of Russia's population in late 19th century still suffered from class inequality and fiat imposed on all aspects of their life, including family relations. Moreover, the fatal lack of foresight on the part of Russian authorities led to a number of statutes in the 80-90s that further limited peasants' personal and civil freedoms. The thrust of the government propaganda in rural areas was to implant official religiosity and blind monarchist beliefs while keeping general education standards very low.

These policies served to maintain patriarchal dispositions, backwardness and idiocy in peasants. Other factors, however, were exerting a growing impact on the peasantry. They were linked to the progress of capitalism and looming change to bourgeois democracy in Russia. Migration of big rural cohorts, including abroad, prompted by burgeoning free handicrafts facilitated the peasants' independence and greater social demands. The irresistible, if slow, spread of literacy, especially in major rural settlements, broadened the peasants' political outlook and added to their self-respect. Of great impact was work done by the reform-minded rural intelligentsia - teachers, doctors, agricultural experts, etc. Meanwhile, neo-narodniks (populists) and, to a lesser degree, social democrats, launched a wide propaganda campaign prior to the revolution. Action taken by Russian industrial workers had considerable impact on the peasantry, too. The combined effect of the above trends led to a 1905-07 situation where for the first time in post-reform Russia endeavors of millions of peasants shifted away from purely economic demands and in some ways developed into political movements.

Soviet analysts of rural development under capitalism have frequently analyzed peasants' political philosophy. In most cases historians have treated the subject from a »general and integrated« perspective. There are, of course, cases of specific study but their authors, too, fail to rise above descriptions of isolated aspects of peasants' outlook. Despite a host of difficult questions left unanswered in this area, the dozens of available sources are not able to offer more or less exact insights even on the basic subjects. A few examples suffice to prove the point.

Peasants' political philosophy, like that of any other class, estate or group, reflects their needs, concerns and aspirations; shows social beliefs and dispositions, and expresses attitudes to other classes, parties and groups, as well as to current regime and property ownership forms. A very complex and structured phenomenon like political philosophy has, of course, its own framework that has to be reproduced before it is understood. Researchers have so far dealt with a very limited array of philosophy components associated with certain needs, strivings, dispositions and myths typical of the peasantry. The entire »array« of these components, their place and function in the total framework have yet to be clarified.

For this, it is vital to identify links between »traditionalist« and revolution-oriented types of outlook. Earlier studies reduced that problem to a gradual, if controversial, passing over from one type to the other. The »coexistence« between the two has not been studied empirically and it is not clear how »pure« or, conversely, syncretic were the views held by various groups of the peasantry'.

First authentic sources describing peasants' political philosophy in capitalist Russia were drawn during the 1905-07 revolution - requests, appeals, applications, resolutions and telegrams related to political developments and sent by peasants' meetings to the tsar and the various governmental bodies; to the State Duma (parliament) and political parties and organizations; to editorial boards of newspapers, etc.

It should be remembered that many European countries saw such documents frequently appear in great numbers over the 18-20th centuries. A great lot of them were drawn up on the eve of the Great French Revolution and during the 1848-49 revolution in Germany. Similar documents appeared everywhere in Russia after the 1917 February revolution. In 1989 when the 1st Congress of the USSR People's Deputies was held, some 300,000 letters and telegrams arrived to it from all over this country - apparently an all-time record of popular participation.

Researchers highly appreciate appeals and requests as sources of historical knowledge. R. Toqueville described the 1789 pleas as a »document which is one of its kind in history« (2). E. Championne wrote an extensive study on appeals and requests drawn up prior to the French revolution (3). The amount of information set forth by customary graphic and descriptive means can be greatly increased if state-of-the-art technology for large-text analysis is applied. A striking example is H. Best's study of appeals sent to the 1848-49 Frankfurt parliament. The study is of interest both in its approach to the source and results obtained (4).

The fundamental novelty of what was said in peasants' appeals and requests during 1905-07 immediately attracted the attention of the public and researchers. Over 70 special and general works were released since 1906 covering this sources in a more or less detailed manner (5).

This extensive research produced impressive results. Over one thousand documents have come to be widely used by scholars. Their study has recently led to greater use of both descriptive and quantitative analyses.

Not all information contained in that source, however, has been retrieved. The common definitive feature of research done was that too much attention paid was to demands and appeals - a very important component, indeed, but representing a relatively small fraction of the total body of appeals and requests. The greater part of the text presented as views, requests, greetings, warnings, promises, etc. have been little analyzed or, if analyzed, only served to illustrative purposes.

This weakness is not rooted in »neglect« but rather in a narrow and non-structured approach to the source. It is almost impossible to account for the above elements since, despite their vast quantities, they are not seen by researchers as a formalized class of demands and appeals.

A special method must exist to account for significant units of substance throughout the text. Researchers would then be able to structure »concealed« evidence scattered in a big source and »imperceptible« in an individual document. That objective can well be achieved by content analysis widely used by researchers, including in history.

Content analysis implies splitting a text in meaningful units. Units may be constituted by key words, concepts, views, etc. Take, for instance, a very brief telegram sent to the Labor Group of the 1st Duma (parliament congress) by peasants of the Bolshaya Zimnitsa village in Mogilev Region: »Bolshaya Zimnitsa peasants (Bykhovsky District), of whom there are 800 men and women, together with the village head, express compassion with people's demands. Demand land, freedom, liberation of the fighters for the people's freedom. As you are empowered by the people, you have full support from the people in your action. You go ahead and we shall follow. Authorized by society - Diaikov« (6).

Even this succinct text gives an idea, if not precise in all respects, of the needs, concerns, attitudes and dispositions associated with certain issues and myths entertained by peasants that approved the document. Information density is so high here that no less than 8 positions can be identified:

- 1) demand for land (in general form);
- 2) demand for democratic freedoms (in general form);
- 3) demand for amnesty to political prisoners;
- 4) approval of Labor Group activity;
- 5) confirmation of the identity of Group demands' with people's appeals;
- 6) recognition of the Group's leading role in the struggle of the people;
- 7) appeal to adhere to aggressive tactics;
- 8) confirmation of support.

A similar procedure applied to 200 documents passed in 1905-1907 by peasants of 275 villages (over 500,000 residents) in the Samara and Voronezh regions has allowed the author of this article to identify 177 such positions (7). Their recurrence rate ranges from 1 to 105 (weighted mean 11.4). They reflect broad swings in peasants' political outlook from hopes for partial improvements within existing social order to radical revolutionary bents (8).

The number of positions identified is in itself evidence that the »quota« of 20-30 positions generally applied in Soviet historical research does not represent the full scope of information in appeals and requests. This »quo-

ta« is an outcome of excessive generalization which, among other drawbacks, breaches the fundamental rule of stage-by-stage analysis and falsely asserts the broad similarity of the various demands advanced by peasants. Indeed, a thorough analysis of positions obtained shows convincingly that the »likeness« is only superficial and misleading. Affinity of substance is much more limited than expected a priori while the high diversity of the peasants' »program« can hardly be denied (9).

The set of positions similar to that identified in 200 documents is, definitely, of great value in analyzing the social concerns, needs and strivings of peasantry. Despite their uniqueness, however, they represent only an initial stage in the analysis of peasants' philosophy. The next stage is to identify internal links between individual positions. Each one is more or less frequent and stands therefore in a certain relation to the others. Done from this perspective, the analysis can produce required data on the orientations, conditions, and especially the overall structure of peasants' views. This major insight into peasants' political philosophy is yet conspicuously and totally absent from our historical research.

A measure of »closeness« in relations between the above positions can only be provided using well-known methods of mathematical statistics. Description of linkages between qualitative features can be made using mutual correlation ratios. There are several such ratios rather closely associated to each other. We have applied the Chuprov coefficient (T) whose value ranges from 0 to 1. Value 0 means statistical independence of a couple of features. The coefficient is very »strict«, however, and sufficiently »economical« in producing high values even when the measure of mutual correlation is high.

As the group of appeals and requests analyzed is not very big, many positions have low statistical weight (10). To achieve more stable results of quantitative analysis, larger groups are advisable. All the 177 attributes have therefore been studied to establish a measure of their closeness in substance. Following that, they were brought into »larger groups« of the same attributive class (11). Seventy-nine broad positions that are usually described as categories have thus emerged. Of them, 19 categories have occurred only once or twice in the entire text and there was definitely no need to calculate T values for them. Only 60 categories with recurrence ratios of three and more have thus been put in for computer-aided analysis.

Prompted by a program, the computer identified links with T values of 0.1 and over. Preliminary analysis of the resulting system showed that ratios over 0.15 have a role to play in establishing the structure of peasants' views. From 60 categories, forty-two had T values over 0.15. To facilitate comprehension of the structure, a graph was drawn where circles designate category lines - relations between categories (see diagram).

Highest values showing closest links are between 0.8 and 0.4. There are four such areas (lines crossed by three dashes). The diagram shows that such lines »link« 5 categories to form two groups. One group includes, first, demands for peasants-held land to stay under community jurisdiction (category 7) and for small land ownership and credit to be expanded through state assistance (9), and, second, negative views of operations by the Peasant Bank (8). The usual peasants' hopes are thus evident that their land and financial needs can be met within the existing framework of relations. A different picture emerges at the »intersection« of demands for income tax (13) and universal free education (31). The unusual thing here is that improved conditions for peasants are seen to come through social, economic and cultural equality. This is a fundamentally new and, more importantly, extremely stable feature, in statistical terms, of peasants' political views that, unlike previous one, has objectively political nature.

How does public opinion crystallize at lower levels? Six values stand between 0.4 and 0.3 (lines with two dashes). They add nine more categories to the five of the previous »orbit«. In addition to earlier groups that may be seen as »traditionalist« and »mixed« (owing to their setup at the superior level), three more are formed comprising two categories each.

The traditionalist group links the demand for expansion of small land ownership (9) to a demand for improving the conditions of rural and municipal workers (32), on the one hand, and, on the other, to a category that, in terms of the Russian revolution, was seen as strongly opportunistic peasants' tendency, i.e. the view that reimbursement may be instituted for land alienated from land-owners (17). The mixed group naturally links the income tax demand (13) with the demand to suppress estate inequality of peasants and to reform courts and local administration (30).

New groups are significant in that two of them are, first, purely political and, second, very »harmonious« in their substance. Thus, a demand for a Constituent Assembly (18) is »logically« linked to peasants' distrust of Duma owing to its impotency (26). Another »intersection« to be defined as »antigovernment - anti-Duma« (mark the stress on »anti«) links the need to provide the Duma with all-round support in its fight against the government (27) to appeals for Duma to be firm and resolute in defending the interests of the people (36). The third group looks very funny at a first glance. The demand for an 8-hour work day for rural and urban workers (29) is shown to be linked to an appeal to cancel the state monopoly on wine trade (16). So striking a relationship, particularly at such a high level (!) proves that long hours and wine monopoly were seen by peasantry as tools designed to entrench economic exploitation and spiritual depraving of the people. Supposedly, we are dealing here with a particularly striking case of implicit cause-effect relationship detected by statistical means.

Let us »go down« to a lower »orbit« and analyze links between values 0.3 and 0.2. Twenty-four positions are in this range (see lines with one

dash). They »add« fourteen more categories to the earlier five groups and, in addition, form a new group of two categories. That group may be defined as »anti-landlord«. Condemnation of self-seeking interest and poaching by landlords (40) is conjugated with denunciation of a system imposed on the peasantry by which they have to lend their labor to land-owners to reimburse for all kinds of loans made on ruinous terms (11).

Each of the three groups in the previous »orbit« received a new category. The »anti-government - anti-Duma« was completed by the old revolutionary appeal for »land and freedom« (37). The Constituent Assembly bloc of appeals was completed with a demand for the Assembly to resolve the land issue (3). The 8-hour workday and wine monopoly elimination group has a »newcomer« represented by demands for bigger food loans and assistance to peasantry in times of starvation and cattle epidemics (15). The additions clearly conform to the »spirit« of each group.

The greatest additions were made to the »previous« groups. The traditionalist one was expanded by four categories the mixed group, in contrast, by seven. In the former case the categories include the demands:

- to hold Duma (parliament congress) (35);
- to stop collecting church maintenance taxes and to feed the church through state allocations (39).

Next come appeals for the union of all »workpeople« (20), on the one hand, while, on the other, »opportunistic« hopes were expressed that the »aspired goals« of the people may be achieved through peaceful means (41). This orbit, too, displays the conflict already observed within the traditionalist group of categories where revolutionary spirit neighbors that of reformers.

Categories added to the mixed group are essentially different from those arriving to the traditionalist one. Social and economic demands include nationalization (1) and transfer of land to those working it (4). Political categories include demands for universal, equal, direct and secret ballot (23) and democratic freedoms (22); »full powers« of Duma and government's accountability to it (33); amnesty to the champions of the »popular cause« (24), and the lifting of military rule, and disbanding of police and »land« authorities (25).

The following picture thus emerges from the latter and previous »orbits«. All the 30 categories »wound up« by linkages have been split into six groups, four small and two big ones. The latter are clearly the center of »gravity« since nineteen out of thirty categories have been listed here. The big groups definitely differ by their structure. Traditionalistic one contains demands, appeals, etc. that often conflict each other in their political substance while the mixed group is distinguished by political harmony.

The fourth, final »orbit« comprises 36 ratios between values 0.20 and 0.15 (lines without dashes). Of them twenty-five describe links between categories earlier involved in networks described above. They thus fill gaps between lines linking the earlier 30 categories. The remaining 11 ratios describe relations between 12 newly added categories.

Big changes have thus occurred in the entire system. Two new groups have formed from the newly added ones, and very curious ones indeed! The »anti-discrimination« label fittingly describes one of them since it comprises demands for equality of all Russian peoples (28) and conviction that ethnic and religious discrimination and women's inequality are not to be accepted (38). The other group combines social and economic categories of revolutionary caste: resolutions on seizing land from land-owners and Treasury (2); the demand for peasants to own land on a community and egalitarian basis (5) and condemnation of taxes and duties (12).

Another development occurred when two big groups have again been increased but this time through incorporation of three smaller groups. The »eight-hour and wine monopoly« group has been firmly linked by all of its categories to the traditionalist group. The latter has taken on two more categories that, like in previous orbits, clearly contradict each other politically. On the one hand, there is the »firm« condemnation of ruinous taxes (14), while on the other appears a chauvinist appeal for the »united and indivisible Russia« (42).

The mixed group »joins« itself to the Constituent Assembly group through several categories. The latter has also been replenished by such »militant« categories as denunciation of the »high lords party« of constitutional democrats for its subservience to the government (21), and peasants' willingness to fight for its interests (19).

The anti-landlord »flock« was logically completed by a demand for land-lease price reduction (10), on the one hand, an expression of willingness to fight the Constituent Assembly group already included in the mixed one. The latter counts 19 categories overall as a result of the merger.

If we descend to a yet lower »orbit« (0.15-0.10), all »smaller« groups counted out from the »big ones« (»antigovernment-Anti-Duma«, »anti-discrimination« and the cluster of revolutionary social and economic categories) would have again gone to the mixed group (dotted lines).

The modelling of political philosophy in 275 rural settlements has thus produced two subsystems that virtually do not »communicate«. Adding up to 33 (out of 42), they are joined by a narrow »isthmus« of the demand to stop taxing people to maintain the church (39). The total of categories in the traditionalist group shows an apparent controversy. Revolutionary dispositions are »drawn into« the system at various levels while, concurrently, evidence of monarchist and reformist attitudes is added. Overall, a traditional, if revolution-infiltrated peasants' dispositions are evident with

hopes for supreme authority's responsibility and reforms from above to improve the condition of the rank and file.

The second subsystem also exhibits controversies but of a different nature. It is shown, e.g. that political views in the 275 settlements comprise feebly correlated subdivisions within the overall system of public opinion, with some »carrying« appeals, views, etc. so typical for peasantry, and others exhibiting mostly new and, more importantly, mutually harmonious elements in terms of political orientation.

The analysis leads us to a clearly fundamental question of interpreting the sufficiently autonomous opinion subsystems. Does the former reflect the mind cast of peasants that have passed the resolutions and appeals while the latter - that of the other group? Or should we see them as different layers in the minds of the same peasants?

It should seem logical to agree to the first scenario. Especially so if we remember that the resolutions and demands have been passed in regions with widely differing conditions of peasants and the intra-regional »rainbow« hues in their substance (12). To verify the assumption, the author has again studied the 177 initial positions. Groups were identified of various political orientation. A test was then made to identify mutual recurrence in each of the 200 requests of positions more or less typical for revolutionary radicalism, on the one hand, and signs of peasantry hopes placed on the Duma, as well as their monarchist and reformist attitudes, on the other (13).

The study produced the following results. »Revolutionary« positions (87) are evident in 181 out of 200 resolutions and requests (90.5 per cent). Duma-related myths (26) are evident in 152 documents (76 per cent). Monarchist and reformist strivings (15) - in 33 documents (16.5 per cent). The above figures mostly speak for themselves. It is clear that revolutionary and Duma related attitudes were inevitably »intersecting« in many documents. The number of such is, indeed, impressive - 137 overall. Monarchist and reformist positions coexist with revolutionary ones in 31 documents.

Although basically conjugated, the above groups are somewhat independents. The degree of the »independence« widely varies, however. It is absolutely clear, for instance, that a greater statistical independence exists of revolutionary attitudes from Duma-related positions and monarchist and reformist attitudes. Indeed, the number of documents showing revolutionary dispositions »free« from Duma-related hopes adds up to a quarter of the total number (44 out of 181) while only a tenth of Duma-related positions (15 out of 152) are independent from revolutionary dispositions. Comparison of monarchist and reformist attitudes produces an unequivocal conclusion - 82.9 per cent of documents with revolutionary dispositions do not contain monarchist and reformist attitudes while revolution-

nary dispositions are only absent from two out of 33 resolutions enshrining monarchist beliefs. The relatively greater autonomy of revolutionary beliefs in the texts and, hence, in peasants' minds who passed them is also well visible in that »purely revolutionary« documents (i.e. free from both Duma-related positions and monarchist and reformist attitudes) were much more numerous - 39 out of 200 (19.5 per cent) than »purely Duma related positions« - 14 (7 per cent) or, especially so, »purely monarchist and reformist attitudes« - 1 (0.5 per cent).

The »diffusion« of positions from various groups occurring when aggregate results are compared does not exhaust the problem of controversies in the peasants' mind. We should also find whether »diffusion« occurs when the most representative and significant indicators are compared instead of »gross« ones.

Take, e.g. agrarian positions that occupy a central place. Most radical and comprehensive are demands to abolish private land-ownership, to transfer all land to those who work it, i.e. to the peasantry (people); to institute community land-ownership and egalitarian land use.

Next come resolutions on expropriating land from the Treasury, private owners and, finally, the statements to the effect that the land issue is to be resolved either by Constituent Assembly or by local peasants committees (14). Such positions are observed in 60 documents. Another center of gravity among agrarian positions is, naturally, those reflecting reform orientations associated with a solution to the land issue, namely the possibility of the state buying out private land at »fair« prices, and several appeals and statements saying that the land issue is to be resolved by the Duma. To these, evidence should be added of the peasants' hope that their »innermost goals« (i.e. land in the first place) can be achieved through peaceful process. The above »opportunistic« attitudes are contained in 27 documents.

Research shows that cases of mutual recurrence of positions representing the opposing agrarian views held by the peasantry do exist in a considerable number: 15 requests out of 60 (a quarter), containing the most radical agrarian demands also contain reform appeals! That means that conflicts between the various peasants' views on solutions to the land issue are evident even at this level.

As for politics, the best idea of peasants' radical attitudes is given in positions recognizing the leading role of workers in revolution and the need for peasantry to consolidate around the All Russian Peasants Union and Labor Group. Next come demands for constituent assembly and republican regime; willingness to use all means to achieve victory; specific resolutions to remove local authorities, expel the police and put up resistance to troops. Finally, statements of distrust for the Duma and the Constitutional Democrats Party. They are opposed, first, by evidence of monarchist myths and, second, by manifestations of reformist strivings alrea-

dy described above. The resulting picture differs little from the previous one. Fourteen documents out of sixty-four containing the most radical positions also contain their »counterparts«.

If we consolidate agrarian and political positions we shall find that 37 most radical attitudes are evident in 80 resolutions while 23 monarchist and reformist attitudes in 44. The »overlap« zones are found in 23 sources. In other words, the most radical appeals contained in a quarter of requests are oddly mixed with opposing monarchist and reformist attitudes strivings. On the other hand, the former are here, too, much more independent since they »balance« monarchist and reformist attitudes in more than half of the documents while the latter do so only in a quarter of the texts.

Summing up the results we arrive at the following conclusions. There are 39 resolutions showing »purely revolutionary beliefs«, 14 - »purely Duma-related positions«, one with »purely monarchist and reformist attitudes«. Thus overall the 54 »pure« documents add up to a little more than a quarter (27 per cent of the entire body of texts). The remaining three quarters (73 per cent) display the controversial and syncretic nature of their authors' political outlook. The results are striking, to say the least, and overrule the initial »logical« assumption that the traditionalist and revolutionized subsystems are typical of different peasantry groups. »Diffusion« evident in 73 per cent of the sources gives clear proof that the subsystems are mostly present in the minds of the same peasant groups.

The 1905-07 Russian revolution was indeed »revolutionary« for Russian peasantry in that the array of views set forth by them was constantly replenished by ever new ideas throughout the period. These ideas were not imprinted on a tabula rasa, of course, but were superimposed on a system of more or less established attitudes. As a result, revolution-implanted ideas have mixed in most bizarre ways with patriarchal views even among radical rural residents. The most curious thing is that the analyzed 275 settlements were not only radical in their political outlook but, as our special study has shown, the most radical in their action. Both the Samara and Voronezh Regions produced the most active sectors of peasant movement in the years of the revolution (15). In other words, the incompatibility of external and traditional views and the combination of adequate views on social objectives and naive hopes regarding ways to achieve them is quite a normal »feature« even in peasants that led the 1905-07 movement. A most striking example of the syncretic nature of public opinion is evident here.

The 1905-07 requests and appeals are thus an authentic source providing a vast amount of descriptive evidence on the political views of Russian peasantry. Extracting this evidence from texts, however, requires special approaches and great effort.

Indeed, any source confronts the a researcher with the inevitably restricted capacity of human perception - described by the wellknown Mul-

ler's »magic number«. When extensive sources are involved, this perceptive weakness is all the more an obstacle to obtaining knowledge. It may only be overcome using special methods.

Content-analysis has produced much more »Information« than traditional ways of analyzing resolutions and requests. Mathematical methods used in its processing enabled us to achieve required detail of knowledge on internal relations within a public mind. The result has allowed to overcome the fragmenting of concepts set forth by historical science on that subject. The model built shows the many tiers existing in the peasants' political philosophy, the intricate linkages between strivings for revolution and conservative attitudes, and its overall inherent syncretism.

The possibility of effective use of content analysis, mathematical methods and modelling in the study of peasants' political outlook are not exhausted by our research, of course. At present we can only speak of first steps in its application.

Notes

1. Participants in the debate hold opposite views. Some pass the »blame« for the totalitarian »outcome« of the Russian revolution on the people itself (I.R. Kliamkin) while others accuse Marxism (A. Tsypko).
2. Toqueville A. *Starii poriadok i revoliutsia*, Moscow, 1905. P.9.
3. Championne E. *Frantsia nakanunie revoliutsii po nakazam 1789*, St. Petersburg 1906.
4. Best, H., *Analysis of Content and Context of Historical Documents. The Case of Petitions to the Frankfurt National Assembly 1848/49*. In: *Historical Social Research. The Use of Historical and Process-Produced Data*. Clubb, J. and Scheuch, E.K. (eds.), Stuttgart, 1980. Pp. 244-266; Best, H., *Interessenpolitik und nationale Integration, 1848/49*.// Göttingen, 1980 etc.
5. List of basic studies, see: Bukhovets. O.G. *K Metodike izucheniia »pri-govornogo« dvizhenia i ego roli v borbe krestianstva v 1905-1907*. (Istoria SSSR, 1979, No. 3, p. 96-97); Bukhovets O.G. *Massovye istochniki po obshestvennomu soznaniu rossiiskogo krestianstva* (Istoria SSSR 1986, No. 4. p. 105).
6. Central State Historical Archive of the USSR, section 91, list 1, file 837, p. 50.
7. Full list of positions is given in the article »Massovye istochniki...« p. 115-118.
8. See: Ibid. Pp. 106-109; Bukhovets O.G. *Political Consciousness of the Russian Peasantry in the 1905-07 Revolution: Sources, Methods, and Some Results*, In: *Russian Review, American Quarterly...* 1988. Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 361-364.

9. See: »Massovyie istochniki...« , p. 108-109; **Political Consciousness...** p. 364.
10. See: »Massovyie istochniki...« p.115-118.
11. See: Bukhovets O.G. Matematika v isledovanii obshchestvennogo soznanii: krestianskie prigovory i nakazy 1905-1907 // Chislo i mysl\ Issue 9. Moscow, 1986, p. 42; **Political Consciousness...** p. 365.
12. See: »Massovyie istochniki...« p.110; **Political Consciousness...** p. 364.
13. See: »Massovyie istochniki...« p.112-118.
14. Ibid, and below see p. 115-118.
15. The subject is treated by Bukhovets O.G. K Metodike izucheniia »prigovornogo« dvizheniia i ego roli v borbie krestianstva v 1905-1907. (Istoria SSSR, 1979, No. 3, p. 96-97); same author. »Prigovornoe« dvizhenie krestian v 1905-1907. A summary of a Doctor's Thesis. Moscow., 1984.

Figure 1.

The Structure of Peasants' Political Philosophy in the Russian Revolution (A Model)

